PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		026125-000200US	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via EFS-Web with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 16, 2007.	Application Number		Filed
	10/804,472		March 18, 2004
TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP	First Name of	First Named Inventor	
By:/Janet L. Newmaker/		Michael W. Diesch	
Janet I., Newmaker	Michael W. Diesch		
	Art Unit	Art Unit Examiner	
	2163		Alford W. Kindred
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest.			Branch/
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.		Irvin E. Branch	
(Form PTO/SB/96)		Typed or printed name	
attorney or agent of record. Registration number 42,358		303-571-4000	
		Telephone number	
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.			6, 2007
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34.		D	ate
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignces of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.			

61091301 v1

*Total of 1 form is submitted.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed via EFS-Web with the United States Patent and Trademark Office on July 16, 2007.

Attorney Docket No.: 026125-000200US

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

/Janet L. Newmaker/ Janet L. Newmaker

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Confirmation No.: 7248

> Michael W. Diesch et al. Examiner: Alford W. Kindred

Application No.: 10/804,472 Art Unit: 2163

Filed: March 18, 2004

For: Automated Record Searching

And Output Generation Related

Thereto

Customer No.: 67590

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW PATENT

Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir

The Applicants request review of the final rejection for the above-identified application. A response after final was filed on June 18, 2007. No amendments to the claims are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal.

The review is requested for the reasons stated herein.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicants respectfully request review of the pending rejections. The sole reference cited against all claims does not teach each and every claim element, either expressly or inherently, as required for a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Specifically, for example. Fries does not teach or suggest "wherein receiving property record data for a plurality of parcels into a computer system comprises: receiving a plurality of images representing the property record documents; converting the images to electronic image data; paginating the electronic image data into related groups representing individual documents; identifying a document type for each individual document; identifying data fields on each individual document; using a combination of computer-implemented processes and manual processes to convert information in the data fields into electronic information; and organizing the electronic information into property record data." The Office Action cites \$\|[0043]-[0044]\$ for this teaching. At this location, however, Fries appears merely to teach the processor and I/O portions of a typical computer. At this location, Fries does not teach anything having to do with receiving property record according to the specific steps claimed by the Applicants. Moreover, Fries does not teach such limitations anywhere else. Hence, claim 1 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Claim 25 includes similar elements and is believed to be allowable for similar reasons. Claims 2-18 and 20-24, which depend from claim 1, and claims 26-28, which depend from claim 25, are believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above.

Claim 30 recites "using the identifier to search the database and select from the property record documents a set of relevant documents relating to the parcel; ... using the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary." Fries does not teach this. Fries' title examination system does not identify relevant documents and use the set of relevant documents to produce a data summary. Hence, claim 30 is believed to be allowable, at least for this reason.

Pre-Appeal Brief Request dated July 16, 2007

Moreover, Fries does not teach scoring relevant documents based on their degree of relevance as recited in claims 34 and 42. The paragraphs in Fries cited by the Office Action as teaching a document scoring system (¶ [0037]-[0038]) appear to relate to a parcel scoring system and have nothing to do with a system for scoring the relevance of documents. Hence, for at least the foregoing reasons, claims 34 and 42 are believed to be allowable over the cited reference.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above and are believed to be allowable, at least for the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 16, 2007

/Irvin E. Branch/ Irvin E. Branch Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

Tel: 303-571-4000 Fax: 415-576-0300

IEB/jln 61091304 v1